

**REMARKS**

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-6, 13-19, and 21-30, and added new claims 31-111. The pending claims are 31-111.

The Office Action stated that Applicant was to submit the art referred to in the specification on page 5 at lines 11-17. The specification stated, in part, that “[t]he assignee has developed a software program known as PC-NAS. An early version of this program was incorporated into a government computer system more than one year before the priority date of this application” (specification at page 5, lines 11-13). This statement is incorrect. PC-NAS was not incorporated into a government computer system more than one year before the priority date of this application, and, further, Applicant does not consider PC-NAS to be prior art. For this reason, and because PC-NAS is no longer available, Applicant is not submitting further information about PC-NAS. Applicant also notes that the specification incorrectly describes the functionality of PC-NAS at page 5, lines 13-17. To avoid any misstatements in the specification, Applicant has amended the specification to delete the entire reference to PC-NAS.

The previously pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious either over Hermansen, or over Oshika in view of Hermansen. Applicant submits that these rejections are moot in light of the cancellation of claims. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 31-111 are patentable over the applied art of Oshika and Hermansen. Oshika describes using a Hidden Markov Model to classify an input name according to language, followed by applying rules for generating variants of the input name. Hermansen catalogs and analyzes various techniques in the art, describes a variety of shortcomings of the art, and highlights areas for further study. However, neither Oshika nor Hermansen disclose or suggest at least “selecting an algorithm that is based on names in the particular culture” and “comparing the input name and the stored name using the algorithm” (claim 31, see also claims 73 and 74), or “accessing a classifying algorithm that is based on linguistic analysis of names in a particular culture; . . . processing the input name using the classifying algorithm; [and] . . . providing an indication of whether the input name belongs to the particular culture based on the processing” (claim 75, see also claims 109-111).

Applicant : John Chrisitan Hermansen et al.  
Serial No. : 09/275,766  
Filed : March 25, 1999  
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 16441-012001

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed in this case on April 17, 2002, citing two references. As receipt of these references was not acknowledged in subsequent Office Actions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider those references and return the initialled Form PTO-1449 to the undersigned.

Enclosed is a \$2,080 check for excess claim fees (\$1,130) and for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$950). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: MAR-CH 15, 2004

Brian J. Dorini  
Reg. No. 43,594

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331